

**MINUTES OF INTRODUCTION OF RNP AR PROCEDURES AT EGLC (ACP-2025-003) ASSESSMENT  
MEETING  
HELD ONLINE ON WEDNESDAY 19<sup>TH</sup> MARCH 2025**

19<sup>th</sup> March 2025

Present	Appointment	Representing
	Airspace Change Account Manager	CAA
	Airspace Regulator (Technical)	CAA
	Airspace Regulator (Economist)	CAA
	Airspace Regulator (Engagement and Consultation)	CAA
	Airspace Regulator (Environmental)	CAA
	Airspace Regulator (IFP)	CAA
	Airspace Regulator (Economist)	CAA
	Airspace Change Account Specialist (Portal)	CAA
	Principal Airspace Regulator	CAA
	Inspector ATS (Operations)	CAA
	Airspace Regulator (Technical)	CAA
	Senior Director Transformation and Change	LCY
	Head of Planning	LCY
	Head of Sustainability and Environment	LCY
	Airspace Change Expert	NATS
	Project Manager	NATS
	IFP Procedure Designer	NATS
	IFP Procedure Designer	NATS
	General Manager ATS LCY	NATS

**CAA Assessment Meeting Opening Statement**

CAA noted that they received the presentation, agenda and Statement of Need in advance of the Assessment Meeting and confirmed that the documents must be published by the sponsor, together with minutes of the meeting, on the Airspace Change Portal page. CAA explained the purpose of the meeting and confirmed that the meeting was an Assessment Meeting and not a Gateway. The CAA reinforced that the sponsor was required to provide a broad description of their proposed approach to meeting the CAA's CAP 1616 requirements, but the CAA was not deciding whether the proposed approach met the detailed requirements of the CAA's process at this stage. The purpose of the Assessment Meeting (set out in detail in CAP 1616) was broadly:

- for the Sponsor to present and discuss their Statement of Need,
- to enable the CAA to consider whether the proposal concerned falls within the scope of the formal airspace change process, including determining whether the proposal falls within the scope of a pre-scaled ACP process/Level 1,
- to enable the CAA to consider the appropriate provisional Level to assign to the change proposal.

Additionally, the sponsor was required to provide information on how it intended to proceed to fulfil the requirements of the airspace change process and to provide information on timescales. Lastly, the sponsor was required to provide information on how it intended to meet the engagement requirements of the various stages of the airspace change process.

	ACTION
<p><b>Item 1 – Introduction</b></p> <p>■ opened the meeting and welcomed everyone, and each participant introduced themselves</p>	
<p><b>Item 2 – Statement of Need (discussion and review)</b></p> <p>■ presented the Statement of Need which will introduce RNP AR (GNSS) based procedures. Objective is to allow more advanced next generation aircraft which is cleaner and quieter at LCY whilst preserving all current procedures and infrastructure at the airport.</p> <p>This will allow LCY to increase capacity by having aircraft with a larger seating capacity whilst maintaining within its current operational and planning restrictions.</p> <p>No questions were received on the Statement of Need</p>	
<p><b>Item 3 &amp; 4 – Issues risk and opportunities arising from proposed change</b></p> <p>■ ran through the list of issues and opportunities from the presentations</p> <p>■ asked the CAA for guidance on whether a precedent for procedures that are restricted to a specific aircraft type had been set in the UK?</p> <p>CAA advised that it will be the next step on how to use it and how the aircraft operator wants to use the new procedure.</p> <p>■ emphasised the importance of understanding the regulatory requirements associated with the UK implementation of RNP AR approaches, specifically:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The need (or not) to comply with the Steep Approach compliance checklist for approaches greater than 4.5 degrees given that the proposal is not for steep approach procedures, in addition to the RNP AR compliance checklist, which does not specify a maximum approach angle. This information is required prior to starting the Stage 2 work, as it is a limitation on the viable angles of approach that may be considered for the A320neo aircraft type, which is not steep approach certified.</li> <li>2) The conditions under which a procedure-specific approval may be required for RNP approaches, specifically given the broad design criteria within the PBN design manual, and the implications on any timelines of such procedure-specific approval. This information is required prior to starting the Stage 2 work, as it is a limitation on the design options that may be considered given the required implementation timescales for this ACP.</li> </ol> <p>It is understood that subsequent sessions will be set up with the CAA for discussion of these topics.</p> <p>■ clarified that there are 3 activities to run in parallel</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Airspace Change Process</li> <li>2. LCY need to ensure they are certified against the CS-ACNS regulation</li> <li>3. Ensure that the crew are qualified and certified against the UK Reg (EU) 965/2012 “the Air Operation regulation”. The operators will have to complete a flight operational safety assessment with the flight ops safety inspectors.</li> </ol> <p>These need to be completed in parallel because an RNP AR can be designed and implemented but if the aircraft are not certified and the crew qualified it may take more time for the implementation of the ACP</p>	<p><b>LCY to set up meetings to progress these discussions</b></p>

<p>■ asked the CAA a question with regards to forecasting. In order to do a comparison against the baseline for the change scenario for year 1, if the change is implemented mid year then modelling will not be for a full 12 months, would that be acceptable for the change scenario or does the model need to assume a full years' worth of implementation regardless of the implementation date itself?</p> <p>■ asked the CAA for clarification on data collection for the PIR. If implementation is the middle of Summer that breaks the busy 92 day summer period for data collection. Can we defer data collection if we implement mid 2027 to January 2028 to enable a full calendar years' worth of data collection including across a single 92-day summer period.</p> <p>CAA responded that the PIR requirements will be set out as part of the decision but will clarify after the meeting</p> <p>■ asked whether the current procedures in regards to the steeper approaches are sufficient to mitigate any risks to helicopters on the Heli Routes</p> <p>■ confirmed that there are to be no proposed changes or impact to the heliroutes, all of which will be considered in the IFP designs</p> <p>■ asked whether there are any restrictions on the heli flights when there are restrictions on the instrument approach to 09</p> <p>■ stated that it depends on the level of the helicopter, but they are below the approach path, but it is a consideration that will need to be looked at.</p> <p>■ asked if there are infrastructure changes at the airport for the new type of aircraft that could impact the timeline of the ACP.</p> <p>■ explained that some development work had taken place in 2019/2020 as part of the airport development programme which included the introduction of 8 new stands, the design aircraft at that time was the A320. Therefore, this type of aircraft has already been factored in and there is enough capacity, taxiways are also compliant with this aircraft type so believe no changes to the airfield are required.</p> <p>■ wanted to re-iterate ■ point around the steep approach requirements and the RNP AR requirements and that this will require internal CAA discussion and flight ops to provide additional guidance.</p>	<p><b>CAA to respond with the duration for the forecast modelling for implementation</b></p> <p><b>CAA to respond with data collection duration for PIR</b></p>
<p><b>Item 5 – Current day scenario</b></p> <p>■ explained the set up of the runway</p> <p>No questions were received on the current day scenario</p> <p>Minor amendment requested to the Statement of Need to specify that the RNP AR procedures will support operations on 'Runway 09 and Runway 27'</p>	<p><b>NATS to fill in a new SoN form with the amendment and reference ACP-2025-003</b></p> <p><b>COMPLETED following the assessment meeting.</b></p>

<p><b>Item 6 – Provisional indication of the scale level and process requirements*</b></p> <p>LCY is expecting the change to be scaled as a Level 1 change</p> <p>No questions were received on the provisional scaling</p> <p><i>* When the sponsor submits their gateway materials for each Gateway at the agreed submission deadline, the period between this and the gateway decision will be an analysis by the CAA Airspace Regulatory team (Airspace Regulation) of the documentation submitted, for the purposes of making a recommendation to the CAA Gateway decision maker(s). In conducting the gateway assessment, the CAA is assessing the process employed and its compliance with the guidance stipulated within CAP 1616. It is not an assessment of the merits of the submission itself, which is reviewed at Stage 5 - Decision. We may request documentation from the sponsor that is referred to in the gateway submission but has not been provided as part of the Gateway submission materials. We may also request the sponsor to provide information by way of clarification relating to statements or assumptions made in the submission. Any further information sought by Airspace Regulation at this stage is for clarificatory purposes and is only for determining compliance with the CAP 1616 process.</i></p> <p><i>In any instance where a sponsor has not met the requirements of the process, we will inform them after the gateway decision and advise of next steps.</i></p> <p><i>Please note that <u>this text does not apply to airspace change proposals involving the sole implementation of RNP Instrument Approach Procedures (IAPs) without an Approach Control, as Gateway Assessments are not required. Therefore, this text can be removed from the Assessment Meeting minutes.</u></i></p>	
<p><b>Item 7 – Provisional process timescales*</b></p> <p>█ explained that our proposal is for an accelerated timescale. The consultation has been shorted to 9 weeks and a 2 week turnaround from paperwork submission and the proposed gateway dates. LCY is aware that this is less than what is stipulated in CAP1616 for timescales.</p> <p>LCY is requesting that the CAA look at what can be accommodated to reduce the timescales where possible.</p> <p>LCY is looking for aircraft to be operating on the new procedures by Summer 2027. In order for airlines to be scheduling RNP AP they require 6 months before operating for assurance so the target date for the AIRAC will be January 2027.</p> <p>This then drives the Stage 5 decision for end of September 2026 at the latest and subsequently drives the previous stage activities.</p> <p>█ re-iterated that the change is small and the stakeholders will be heavily involved throughout Stage 2 and early Stage 3 activities. There is an expectation there will be limited options to progress and therefore a reduced consultation is proportionate.</p> <p>The E &amp; C Regulator advised that rationale for any proposed reduced consultation period from the accepted CAA standard of 12 weeks, must be explained within the consultation strategy submitted at stage 3. The rationale will be considered by the CAA at the stage 3 gateway assessment meeting.</p> <p>█ referred to the CAP 1616 requirements for engagement at stages 1 and 2 of the process, including the requirement to seek feedback from stakeholders on the current day scenario as well as proposed design principles. █ highlighted the aviation and non-aviation stakeholder groups that must be engaged with at stages 1 and 2 including local authorities as set out in CAP 1616f paras 2.46 - 2.49.</p> <p>█ - The requirements for the environmental assessments are detailed in CAP 1616i. The change sponsor is required to analyse/quantify the potential direct and indirect environmental impacts of the proposed change as regards noise, local air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, tranquillity and biodiversity. A Habitats Regulation Screening exercise is also required. The quantification/assessment of the</p>	

environmental impact would need to consider the changes in the fleet mix and approaches and additional growth facilitated by the airspace change.

Activity	Submit Paperwork	Proposed Gateway Date
Assessment Meeting (Today)	n/a	n/a
Stage 1 – Define Gateway	16 <sup>th</sup> May 2025	30 <sup>th</sup> May 2025
Stage 2 – Develop and Assess Gateway	15 <sup>th</sup> August 2025	29 <sup>th</sup> August 2025
Stage 3 – Consult Gateway	16 <sup>th</sup> January 2026	30 <sup>th</sup> January 2026
Consultation	2 <sup>nd</sup> March 2026 – 4 <sup>th</sup> May 2026	
Stage 4 – Update and Submit	31 <sup>st</sup> July 2026	
Stage 5 – Decide	25 <sup>th</sup> September 2026	
Stage 6 - Implement	21 <sup>st</sup> January 2027	

CAA will need to give careful consideration to the 8 week period due to resource availability.

*\* The timeline agreed may become subject to change by the CAA. As outlined in CAP 2541 it is not the CAA's intent to conduct a re-prioritisation of all ACPs currently in progress, but only to prioritise when we believe this is required. Such prioritisation will be conducted on a case-by-case basis and in accordance with the principles outlined in CAP 2541. Should it be considered necessary to reprioritise an ACP a member of the Airspace Regulation team will contact the sponsor directly.*

Item 8 – Safety Case requirement<sup>1</sup>

ran through the safety assessment requirements

No questions were received on the Safety Assessment Requirements

Item 9 – Next steps

LCY to upload presentation to the portal suitably redacted

CAA will analyse the timeline and respond accordingly

Draft minutes to be sent for review by 26<sup>th</sup> March where CAA will review and once finalised redacted version to be uploaded to the portal by 2<sup>nd</sup> April

Version 2 Statement of Need reference ACP-2025-003 in Section 2 needs to be added when uploading to the portal

Item 10 – Any other business

No other business

---

<sup>1</sup> *The default position is that if the safety case contains proprietary information which is commercially sensitive in nature, it may be agreed by the CAA not to have it published in its entirety at stage 4. However, it must be submitted to the CAA, labelled accordingly and a Plain English summary of the final safety assessment explaining why the proposal will maintain a high standard of safety, must be published on the Portal, in accordance with CAP1616 para 1.31'.*

## ACTIONS ARISING FROM INTRODUCTION OF RNP AR PROCEDURES AT EGLC (ACP-2025-003) ASSESSMENT MEETING

Subject	Name	Action	Deadline
Meetings	■	Set up follow up meetings for areas where LCY will require further clarification on in particular regulatory requirements associated with the UK implementation of RNP AR	Completed
Forecast Modelling	CAA	In order to do a comparison against the baseline for the change scenario for year 1, if the change is implemented midyear then modelling will not be for a full 12 months, would that be acceptable for the change scenario or does the model need to assume a full years' worth of implementation regardless of the implementation date itself? CAA to respond with the duration for the forecast modelling for implementation	11/04/25
PIR data collection	CAA	Can LCY defer data collection if LCY implement mid 2027 to January 2028 to enable a full calendar years' worth of data collection CAA to clarify	11/04/25
Statement of Need	NATS	Update and up-issue the Statement of Need to reflect that the procedures support both runways 27 and 09	Completed
Presentation	NATS	Upload redacted presentation to portal	24/03/25
Timeline	CAA	Analyse and respond to the timeline	24/03/25
Draft Minutes	NATS	Produce draft minutes for review	26/03/25

London City Airport  
ACP Sponsor